

REMARKSPending Claims

Claims 11-18 have been amended and are currently pending.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and receipt of the priority document.

35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 11, 12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Jobsis et al and claims 13-16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ivers et al. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and for the following reasons.

In particular, each of the independent claims has been amended to include that the head setter has an optical fiber hook, for example as shown in Fig. 20 and designated by reference number 20-7. The optical fiber hook supports the optical fibers 20-2 and 20-3 at a position at other than the end portion of the optical fibers where they are held by the

optical fiber holder 20-4. See page 23 of the specification, which describes Fig. 20. As set forth in the specification, the optical fiber hook supports the optical fiber so that the optical fibers do not come within the player's field of vision. See page 24, lines 5-9 of the specification.

As amended, the pending claims are not anticipated by Jobsis or rendered obvious in view of Ivers. Specifically, Jobsis discloses a module support 35, as shown in Fig. 1, in combination with the part that is comparable to the claimed flexible resin part, which is base support strap 30, which also includes "Velcro" type strips 40-43. However, the reference does not disclose or suggest an optical fiber hook that supports the optical fibers at a position other than at the end portions of the optical fibers where they are supported by the module support 35. Therefore, the claims, as amended, are not anticipated by Jobsis, and the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.


Ivers, in comparison to the present invention, discloses a holder, such as the optical coupler 86 shown in Fig. 5, for holding the ends of optical fibers, however there is no disclosure or suggestion an optical fiber hook that supports

the optical fibers at a position other than at the end portion of the optical fibers. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of the claims as being unpatentable over Ivers should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Mattingly  
Registration No. 30,293  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR  
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: July 23, 2004